



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJAAR_46047
Title of the Manuscript:	EFFICACY OF DIFFERENT ORGANIC MANURES ON GROWTH AND YIELD PERFORMANCE OF ORGANICALLY GROWN TOMATO
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:
(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>Line 11. - The experiment comprised of two different factors: such as Factor A. four types of organic manure such as [M₀= Control (No organic manures application), M₁ = Cowdung (30 t/ha), M₂ = Poultry manure (25 t/ha) and M₃ = Vermicompost (20 t/ha)]. Factor B. three types of variety such as (V₁ = BARI tomato...)</p> <p>- t/ha t.ha⁻¹</p> <p>Line 13. - Keywords (Organic manure, growth, yield, tomato) must be different from those present in the title. You can use a word instead of a compound word or a synonym.</p> <p>- Put keywords alphabetically!</p> <p>Lines 19-22. Add the references!</p> <p>Line 29. resulting in higher the emission... Remove "the" or reformulate!</p> <p>Line 38. Organic manures ... improves Remove "s"</p> <p>Lines 42-47, 62-69. Add the references!</p> <p>Lines 85, 93. 2.4m x 2.4m 2.4 m x 2.4 m 60cm x 40cm 60 cm x 40 cm</p> <p>Line 101. characters of cabbage??? You studied tomato or cabbage?</p> <p>Line 111. 35.68cm 35.68 cm 26.33cm 26.33 cm ditto for the rest of document (Lines 112-116, 122-127, 144, 146-152)</p> <p>Line 140. Figure 1: Fig. 1.</p> <p>Lines 141-142, 157-158, 237-238, 244-245, 329-330 and 334-335. Footnotes should be write with superscript lowercase letters (inclined/italicized). t/ha t.ha⁻¹</p> <p>Lines 154, 234, 240, 325 and 331. Table 1: Table 1. Table 2: Table 2. Table 3: Table 3. Table 4: Table 4. Table 5: Table 5.</p> <p>Lines 156-158. DAT?</p> <p>Line 179. Organic manure varied ???</p> <p>Line 212. significantly for by application</p> <p>Line 213. Table2 Table 2</p> <p>Lines 223-224. The reports are also supported to by the results of...</p> <p>Lines 226-227. Due to combined effect of organic manures and varieties showed significant differences on number of fruits per plant (Reformulate!)</p> <p>Lines 254, 255 and 259. 7.66cm 7.66 cm 6.66cm 6.66 cm 10.94cm 10.94 cm</p> <p>Lines 272-273. 10.18cm 10.18 cm 9.18cm 9.18 cm</p> <p>Line 278. +BARI + BARI (Put space between + and BARI)</p> <p>Line 286. 91.69g 91.69 g</p> <p>Lines 300, 303, 304, 311, 312, 316 and 318. kg/plant kg.plant⁻¹</p> <p>Line 304. 0.99kg/plant 0.99 kg.plant⁻¹</p> <p>Line 312. 1.37kg/plant 1.37 kg.plant⁻¹</p> <p>Lines 341-342. BARI Tomato 15 coupled with poultry manure showed enhanced vegetative and reproductive growth...</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	Minor revision	
Optional/General comments		

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Temegne Nono Carine
Department, University & Country	University of Yaoundé I, Cameroon